



REMARKS

Claims 1-37 are currently pending in the application. Claims 6, 9-12, 14, 15, 20-25, 27, 29 and 33-37 have been withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 13, 16, 17 and 26 stand rejected under 35 USC §112 as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims, as originally presented, are in full compliance with 35 USC §112. However, to further clarify the structure in these claims, claims 13, 16 and 26 have been amended. The scope of the claims is unaffected by this amendment. In light of this amendment, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 13, 16, 17 and 26 under 35 USC §112 is requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 13, 16, 17, 26 and 32 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,109,469 (Clive-Smith) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,232,612 (Winsor). Claims 3, 18, 19, 28, 30 and 31 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as obvious over Clive-Smith in view of Winsor, and further in view of the "ordinary skill in the art".

Claim 1 recites, among other limitations, at least one corrugated sheet defining at least a part of the peripheral wall structure. The at least part of the peripheral wall structure has at least one external panel that is connected to the at least one corrugated sheet so as to define a substantial area of an exposed outside surface.

Clive-smith discloses what is cumulative to what Applicant has identified as prior art in the "Background Art" section of the application, specifically at page 6, beginning in the first full paragraph and continuing through page 7, line 6. The Examiner acknowledges that Clive-Smith does not disclose any corresponding external panel.

The Examiner identifies element 14 in Winsor as a corresponding "external panel". It is respectfully noted that the reference numeral 14 identifies channels on a "wall lining sheet consist[ing] of a corrugated metal sheet 12" (see Winsor column 2, lines 39 and 40).

Further, it would not be obvious for one skilled in this art, with the teachings of Clive-Smith and Winsor in hand, to arrive at the structure in Applicant's claim 1, absent knowledge of Applicant's invention and using the same as a template.

Winsor discloses a corrugated end wall 11 with ridges and grooves extending horizontally, rather than vertically, as recited for the corrugated sheet in applicant's claim 1. Further, there is no corresponding external panel connected to this wall 11. Since Winsor's disclosure is focused upon providing an internal liner that shields the wall 11 from impacts due to shifting of interior loads (see column 1, lines 22-25), one skilled in the art would not be given any direction or motivation to install this same structure on the outside of the wall 11.

Consequently, with the combined teachings of Clive-Smith and Winsor, there is a total absence of disclosure of a corresponding external panel cooperating with a corrugated sheet on a part of a peripheral wall structure, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is believed allowable.

Claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 13, 16, 17, 26 and 32 depend cognately from claim 1 and recite further significant structural detail to further distinguish over the art.

As one example, claims 13, 16, 17 and 26 recite overlapping arrangements of corrugated sheets and external panels that are not taught in the cited art.

Claims 3, 18, 19, 28, 30 and 31, which also depend cognately from claim 1, recite significant additional details that are not taught or suggested in the combination of Clive-Smith and Winsor, as acknowledged by the Examiner. The Examiner supplements this combination, relying on "ordinary skilled in the art".

It is respectfully submitted that this rejection relies upon hindsight, using Applicant's disclosure as a guide. For example, claim 3 characterizes the at least one external panel as defining a substantially continuous planar shape over substantially the entire exposed

outside surface on the one side wall. Since the combined art is devoid of any corresponding external panel, one of ordinary skill in the art with the teachings of Clive-Smith and Winsor in hand, would not be motivated, absent reliance upon Applicant's teachings, to define such an external panel arrangement.

Claim 19 characterizes the at least one corrugated sheet as having a thickness between .25 inch and .50 inches. Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art cited by the Examiner is devoid of any teaching or suggestion of using a corrugated sheet in a structural arrangement as claimed, wherein the thickness is in the range state. Applicant further submits that it is not merely a matter of design to arrive at corrugated sheets with the claimed dimensions.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-5, 7, 8, 13, 16-19, 26, 28, 30-32 and allowance of the case are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
John S. Mortimer, Reg. No. 30,407

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ,
CLARK & MORTIMER
500 W. Madison St., Suite 3800
Chicago, IL 60661
(312) 876-1800

Date: May 23, 2005